

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The final Office Action of June 15, 2009 and Advisory Action dated September 21, 2009, have been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 23 remain in this application. Claims 1, 11, 13, 15, 18 and 22 have been amended and claim 24 has been added. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 6 stands amended pursuant to the Amendment filed September 10, 2009 and thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. More particularly, the Action contends that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the apparatus” as recited. Applicants corrected the clerical error to address the rejection.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-11 and 18-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0143961 A1 to Siegel et al. (“Siegel”) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,434,700 B1 to Alonso et al. (“Alonso”) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2003/0065662 to Cosic (“Cosic”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

a plurality of adapters configured to allow access to the first and second plurality of databases, wherein a first adapter of the plurality of adapters is customized to manage a first database typology and a second adapter, different from the first adapter, is customized to manage a second database typology different from the first database typology.

None of the cited documents teach or suggest such features. Indeed, the Office Action concedes at p. 5 that neither Siegel nor Alonso teaches or suggests a plurality of adapters configured to allow access to first and second plurality of databases. Instead, the Action cites paragraphs [0012] and [0014] of Cosic. However, as discussed in paragraph [0014], Cosic is directed toward a UDMI that includes a processing system to connect multiple standard database management systems and to allow multiple users to access, manage, and manipulate data within each of the standard database management systems. Even assuming, but not conceding, that a

Database Interface (DBI) as described in Cosic constitutes an adapter, Cosic, at best, merely describes the DBI as a *single universal adapter* for connecting to all standard DBMSs. Abstract. The Advisory Action dated September 21 asserts at p. 2 that it has been held obvious to duplicate parts for multiple effects. Even assuming, without conceding, that it would have been obvious to duplicate the DBI, the DBI is a *universal* adapter. Accordingly, the resulting combination would have had multiple *universal* adapters and not first and second adapters, where the first adapter is *customized* to manage a first typology and the second adapter is *customized* to manage a second typology different from the first. Accordingly, even assuming, without conceding, that the asserted combination is proper, the combination would not have resulted in the features as recited in claim 1.

Claims 18 and 22 have been amended to recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. As such, claims 18 and 22 are patentably distinct from the asserted combination of Siegel, Alonso and Cosic for substantially the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 2-11, 19-20 and 23 ultimately depend on claims 1 and 18, respectively. Therefore, dependent claims 2-11, 19-20 and 23 are patentably distinct from a combination of Siegel, Alonso and Cosic for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 18 in addition to the advantageous features recited therein.

Claims 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Siegel, Alonso and Cosic, and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2001/0016880 A1 to Cai et al. (“Cai”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 12-16 ultimately depend on claim 1. With respect to claim 1, Cai fails to cure the deficiencies of Siegel, Alonso and Cosic. As such, even assuming but not conceding that a combination of Siegel, Alonso, Cosic and Cai would have been appropriate, such a combination would not have resulted in each and every feature of claims 12-16. Accordingly, claims 12-16 are patentably distinct from a combination of Siegel, Alonso, Cosic and Cai. Claim 17 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

***New Claim***

Claim 24 has been added. Support for the features recited in claim 24 may be found throughout the originally filed Specification, for example, at p. 7, ll. 3-9.

Claim 24 is dependent on claim 1 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the first adapter is customized to manage only the first database typology and the second adapter is customized to manage only the second database typology.” As noted above, Cosic merely describes a universal interface configured for connecting to all standard DBMSs. Accordingly, Cosic clearly teaches away from an adapter that is customized to manage only a first database typology, much less a second adapter customized to manage only a second database typology. The other cited documents do not cure these deficiencies of Cosic. Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

**CONCLUSION**

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: November 16, 2009

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /Chunhsing Andy Mu/  
Chunhsing Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001